DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 336 778 CS 507 567

AUTHOR Ford-Brown, Lisa A.
TITLE Oral Interpretation as a Pedagogical Tool in Teaching Literary Comprehension and Appreciation.
PUB DATE 3 Apr 91
NOTE 90p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Central States Communication Association (Chicago, IL, April 11-14, 1991).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Education; *Literature Appreciation; *Oral Interpretation; *Reading Comprehension; Reading Research; Silent Reading
IDENTIFIERS Indiana (Terre Haute)

ABSTRACT

A study investigated whether there was a significant difference in the comprehension and appreciation of literature studied through oral interpretation when compared to silent reading. Two hundred and sixty-three third, fourth, and fifth graders from Terre Haute, Indiana were separated into experimental and control groups, and were given pre- and post-tests designed by the researcher. One experimental group performed their own interpretation of a given piece of literature, while the other experimental group was taught the unit and saw the performance. The control group read the literature. Results indicated that elementary students taught the techniques of oral interpretation showed an increase in comprehension and appreciation of literature in general, but did not show an increase in comprehension or appreciation when compared to silent reading. Results also suggested that elementary students participating in an oral interpretation production might have demonstrated an increase in comprehension and appreciation when compared to students participating as audience members in the oral interpretation process. Lack of time spent in the experimental process appeared to cause some problems in the project, as did the testing tools. Research should be continued over a longer period of time. (Twenty-six tables of data are included; 29 references and 17 appendixes including lesson plans, SMOG grading, the literature survey, and the third, fourth and fifth grade comprehension and appreciation pre- and post-tests are attached.) (PRA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED336778

ORAL INTERPRETATION AS A PEDAGOGICAL TOOL IN TEACHING LITERARY COMPREHENSION AND APPRECIATION

Presented at the
1991 Central States Communication Association Convention
Chicago, Illinois
April 3, 1991

---

by
Lisa A. Ford-Brown
Indiana State University

CS507567

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Lisa Ford-Brown

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Many students throughout the United States have been trained to increase their comprehension and appreciation of literature through the common pedagogical tool of silent reading. The students have varied widely in their abilities to understand literature. Studies have shown that silent reading produces poor comprehension and low levels of appreciation (Sullivan 1981; Gallini 1980). Increasingly, teachers have felt the need to be able to improve silent reading as a technique of teaching literature and have often turned to oral reading (Runchey 1931).

Geraldine Runchey stated, "In a classroom, silent reading requires nothing more than a great deal of eye movement, and that the finer values of the teaching of literature can be attained only by oral reading and discussion" (1931, 94). Runchey argued that silent reading consisted of two physical factors: eye movement and the "inner speech." Runchey agreed with other scholars that eye movement development was needed to improve the reader's speed but not at the expense of the distortion of the literature. Runchey purposed that the reader could develop this factor when reading in other lessons requiring such a skill. As for the "inner speech," Runchey felt that the children could not perform this physical factor without the development of oral speech. Therefore, silent reading could not increase comprehension without students first being taught to read orally.

Studies on the effects of reading orally in the classroom have shown that it is of no great value to the students (Pintner 1913; Mead 1916; Stone 1926). In these studies, oral reading was defined as the ability "to pronounce and express orally the printed text" (Mead 1916, 345), with no thought of context. Most of these studies did find that oral reading decreased comprehension of the literature, but they did not deal with appreciation at all. Therefore, scholars like Wallace Bacon claimed that oral reading in class was a waste of time (Bacon 1972, 35).

Louise M. Rosenblatt wrote in Literature as Exploration, "A novel or poem or play remains merely inkspots on paper until a reader transforms them into a set of meaningful symbols" (Kleinau 1980, 3). This need to be "transformed into a set of meaningful symbols" strains for audible speech and a visible body--components the silent and oral reader cannot give to the literature (1980, 3).

The purpose of this study was to present oral interpretation as a means of transforming literature into a set of meaningful symbols. This study was distinguished from other studies in two ways. First, the experimental design was constructed to examine oral interpretation versus silent reading, not oral reading versus silent reading. Oral reading consists of the verbalizing of written material without consideration of the text. Oral interpretation

consists of verbalizing and actualizing a text after dramatic analysis. Second, the study was constructed to consider comprehension and appreciation of literature. By considering both comprehension and appreciation, the study provided insight into the achievement of the main goals of oral interpretation. This achievement was outlined in the definition of oral interpretation offered by Bowen, Aggertt, and Rickert:

> . . .the communication of the reader's impression of the author's ideas and feelings to the eyes and ears of an audience, so that the audience understands the ideas, experiences the feeling, and appreciates the author's literary skill (83).

Oral interpretation has been used as a pedagogical tool in teaching comprehension and appreciation of literature in schools for years. At the elementary level, children are able to retain more and invest in new skills without much effort and have more time to develop these skills. The investment of learning to understand and appreciate literature should take place at the elementary level where effort is minimal.

Oral and silent reading among institutions of education for the purpose of teaching is not new. For decades, educators have been studying the effects of oral reading and silent reading on comprehension and appreciation (Pintner 1913; Mead 1916; Runchey 1931; Stone 1926). Oral reading differs from oral interpretation, but these studies were of great importance to the purpose of this research. The

studies represent the genesis of the review of research in this area.

Oral reading should not be confused with oral interpretation, but should be seen as one of oral interpretation's basic elements. Orally reading the literature is one step in the oral interpretation process and should only be employed after the application of dramatic analysis. Thus, the review of literature began with this genesis and concluded with a focus on the research literature directly in the field of oral interpretation.

Pintner (1913) reported the results of an experiment that measured the effects of oral reading versus silent reading on speed and comprehension. The subjects were twenty-three students in the fourth grade. Eight tests for silent reading and eight tests for oral reading were given. Each test consisted of reading as much as possible during a period of two minutes. After each test, the children had to write down immediately as much as they could recall. Each passage was analyzed into the number of points or thoughts contained in it. The maximum number of lines read orally was 31, and silently 89; the minimums were 9 and 10. The number of points reproduced showed a maximum of 29 orally and 30 silently; the minimum numbers were 5 and 6, and the average points for the whole class were 15 orally and 18 silently.

Pintner concluded that the children read more and retained more during silent reading. Therefore, Pintner found the habit of reading aloud as, "a habit that retards the reading process. . ." (Pintner 1913, 337).

Oral and silent reading were the subjects of a study by Mead in 1917. The questions raised by Mead were which method produced the greatest number of points in thought-getting (comprehension) and which produced the best speed? Five groups of sixth grade children were tested. The material consisted of stories from "Alice In Wonderland" (sic). Six tests of two minutes each were given to the children of five different sixth grade classes using each method. Mead concluded that, with one exception, each class read a greater number of lines silently than orally. Without exception, each class reproduced a greater percentage of possible points by the silent method than the oral.

Both of the aforementioned studies dealt with improving the pronunciation and articulation of words. Pintner and Mead concluded that oral reading supports poor articulation and pronunciation, while slowing down the reading speed of the subjects, thus producing poor comprehension and appreciation.

Stone (1926) published a book dealing with experimental studies on the teaching of oral and silent reading. In sections where the value of oral and silent reading are

discussed, Stone explained that educational programs should emphasize silent reading over oral reading. He supported this emphasis with the belief that oral reading retards the reading rate in silent reading: "The rate of oral reading is necessarily limited by the muscular activities involved in articulating and pronouncing, while silent reading has no such limitation" (Stone 1926, 24). Stone continues this discussion of these methods by citing Pintner and Mead. Unlike Pintner and Mead, Stone supports the value of oral reading on appreciation. "Effective oral reading and singing may be utilized in developing literary appreciation" (33).

The next study added another variable to the measuring of comprehension and appreciation. Young (1936) investigated the effects of listening to literature on comprehension and appreciation. Young measured these two variables in 2,000 fourth through sixth grade students. The students were measured when they read silently and/or listened to a teacher read the literature. Young concluded that listening, reading silently, and listening plus reading did not significantly differ in improving comprehension and appreciation.

Collins (1959) investigated the differences in the amount of comprehension for a given period of time between oral and silent reading. The purposes of the study were to

determine (1) if either manner of reading would produce a significantly higher comprehension score at any level of difficulty, and (2) if either manner of reading produces a significantly higher comprehension score when the scores for all the levels are combined.

Sixty freshmen were selected; 30 performing the oral reading experiment, and 30 performing the silent reading experiment. The oral reading group was compared with the silent reading group. All subjects were tested individually to determine the degree of comprehension.

Collins concluded that for the selections rated "very easy" and "easy," the scores produced were significantly higher; with the selections rated "fairly easy" and "standard," the scores of oral readers were insignificantly higher; while for the selections rated "difficult" and "very difficult," the scores produced by oral readers were insignificantly higher. When all seven levels were combined, and two methods of reading were compared, the total score of the oral readers produced significantly higher scores.

Swalm (1971) conducted an experiment that was designed to determine the effects of oral and silent reading and listening on comprehension.

The subjects were 108 students from the second, third, and fourth grades. The material was appropriate to the reading level. Thirty-six subjects were included in each

testing group within a grade: 12 each from the above-average, average, and below-average groups. The Cloze method[1] was used to measure comprehension. Two hypotheses were tested. First, there would be a difference in the comprehension of material read orally, silently or listened to in the three grades. Results showed that significant differences among the three methods existed only at the second grade. There, oral reading was better than the other two methods. The second hypothesis predicted there would be no difference in the level of comprehension for the above-average, average, and below-average reading abilities for the three methods. The results showed that the reading level of the students was important for determining comprehension effectiveness with the three methods in each group. Swalm concluded that for students with below-average reading ability, listening was more effective for the purpose of comprehension, while the above-average comprehended more through oral and silent reading.

Pintner, Mead, Stone, Young, Collins, and Swalm all examined the basic issue in the debate of oral reading versus silent reading. These studies were important to this present study in two ways. First, educators have been confusing oral reading with oral interpretation. Oral reading has no preparation. Oral interpretation, on the other hand, consists of pre-reading and analyzing the

literature. Second, oral reading functions as important part of the oral interpretation process and, therefore, has some effect on the outcome.

Taylor (1980) cited research that supported oral interpretation as important in helping students to understand and appreciate literature. Taylor stated, "oral interpretation has been found to increase students' appreciation and understanding of literature as well as their motivation to read and improve their reading skill" (Taylor 1980, 363).

Taylor's statement that oral interpretation increases students' appreciation and understanding has been accepted by scholars; it has been the focus of study before his work and since. But, to date, oral interpretation had not found its place as a pedagogical tool in educational institutions. That was where the purpose of this study generates its vitality--to show that oral interpretation could be a useful educational tool. Only three studies dealt directly with the value of oral interpretation as a pedagogical tool. The last two studies were very critical to the design of this study.

Maberry (1975) compared the responses of subjects to three techniques of teaching: silent reading, solo performance, and readers' theatre. Three hundred seventy-one students in three classes in ninth and eleventh grades received three presentations of three short stories.

Immediately after each presentation, the students were administered a semantic differential test and a short objective comprehensive test. Retention and appreciation were tested ten days later. Maberry concluded that appreciation was higher for the readers' theatre technique than either solo performance or silent. Solo performance evoked a higher level of appreciation than did silent. Comprehension scores were higher for readers' theatre than for the other methods.

A dissertation by Campbell (1959) proposed to (1) discover the differences, if any, in the retention and comprehension of poetry resulting from oral interpretation and from silent reading, and (2) discover the differences, if any, resulting from academic training in oral interpretation and in silent reading.

The study was audience-centered. In other words, oral interpretation was studied from the point of view of the audience rather than the oral interpreter.

The subjects were seventy-two college students from lower level speech and English courses divided into groups. A reader using oral interpretation presented six different poems to half the subjects, while the other half of the subjects were asked to read the poems to themselves. Immediately after the presentations of each poem, both groups of subjects completed a questionnaire designed to

measure retention and comprehension. The results reported that silent reading was superior in producing simple retention, while oral interpretation improved comprehension. Even though this produced positive data for oral interpretation as a pedagogical tool, it had flaws in measurement. First, the posttest measures were too long. The subjects had to answer a total of 120 questions. This length could have caused the subjects to answer negatively or simply to pick answers.

Second, Campbell pre-tested graduate students in an experimental methods class and used that data with the posttest collected from the freshman class. This would make the correlation between the two tests invalid because of mental development of the graduate students and their awareness of methods.

The final research of importance in developing the rationale for this study was developed by Bailey (1977). Bailey's study compared the effects on appreciation and comprehension when the quality of oral performance varied. Approximately 225 seventh and eighth grade students were divided into groups and exposed to the poem "Wild Grapes" by Robert Frost. Immediately following the readings, the subjects were given testing devices designed to measure comprehension and appreciation.

The results supported the assumption that poetry read to an audience by highly skilled oral interpretation

students would produce greater literary appreciation. However, the study failed to find any significant differences in comprehension of the literature between the methods.

Bailey's thesis had certain problems. First, Bailey continually stated assertions regarding oral interpretation as a valuable means of studying literature. These assertions could only be made from data comparing oral interpretation to other means of study. The data Bailey collected can not supply such information. Bailey's thesis only measured the different methods of oral interpretation against each other and not against other methods of teaching literature. The second problem in Bailey's thesis was the use of terms in the semantic differential scale. There was no basis for the universality of the terms.

This study has attempted to use the positive elements, from the aforementioned research, to support oral interpretation as a pedagogical tool for increasing comprehension and appreciation of literature. Specifically, the purpose was to discover oral interpretation's value in teaching literary comprehension and appreciation to elementary students. The study predicted that, when comparing pretest and posttest results, there would be a difference between the degree of exposure to oral interpretation and increased comprehension and appreciation.

The question of investigation was: "Is there a significant difference in the comprehension and appreciation of literature studied through oral interpretation when compared to silent reading?"

The study proposed the following hypotheses:

H 1 Elementary students taught the techniques of oral interpretation (Dramatic analysis, vocal delivery, and body movement), along with an opportunity to participate in a performance as a reader, will show an increase in comprehension and appreciation when compared to silent reading.

H 2 Elementary students taught the techniques of oral interpretation, along with an opportunity to participate as an audience member in the oral interpretation process, will show an increase in comprehension and appreciation when compared to silent reading.

H 3 Elementary students participating in an oral interpretation production will show an increase in comprehension and appreciation when compared to elementary students participating as audience members in the oral interpretation process.

The independent variable was three modes of teaching: oral interpretation, silent reading, and the participation in an actual oral interpretation performance. The dependent variables were comprehension and appreciation of literature.

The subjects for the experimental study consisted of two hundred and sixty-three elementary students attending school in the Vigo County School Corporation, Terre Haute, Indiana. The third grade level consisted of ninety-one subjects, the fourth grade level consisted of ninety subjects and the fifth grade level consisted of eighty-five subjects.

The groups within each grade consisted of whole classes randomly selected by the School Corporation. Each class contained students with an average or above average intelligence level.

The normal learning environment was not disturbed because the experiment was conducted in the regular classrooms during the period for teaching English. Permission to work with these students was granted by the School of Education, Indiana State University and the Vigo County School Corporation.

Selection of the literary composition was a critical task in an oral interpretation study, as pointed out in Campbell's and Bailey's studies. First, it was important to decide what genre should be used in the study. Prose fiction was utilized. Two reasons guided this selection.

The first reason was that students in schools today seem to experience more prose than poetry. So, they should have some sense of the structure of prose and should feel more comfortable with this genre, whereas, the lack of experience with poetry might have produced apprehension which disrupts the study. The second reason was that the application of dramatic analysis, a theory of analysis of literature used in oral interpretation, seemed to be easier to understand when applied to prose.[2]

Once the genre was decided, the consistency and unfamiliarity of the literature was considered. The experimental design called for two selections of literature with the same reading level in each grade, literature that had not been previously studied by the subjects. It was necessary for all the literature to be graded at the same level of readability; otherwise, comprehension and appreciation could not be measured accurately. To insure consistency of the reading levels of each selection, the SMOG Grading Test was applied to each story (see Appendix D).

The SMOG Formula was administered because of its simplicity and the high average of predictability.

> The standard error of the predictions given by the simplified SMOG Grade Formula is only about 1.5 grades. In other words, this formula will predict the grade of a passage correctly within one and a half grades in 68 percent of cases. (McLaughlin 642)

The formula consisted of selecting ten consecutive sentences at the beginning of the story, ten in the middle, and ten at the end. Next, all the words of three or more syllables were counted in the thirty sentences and added together. The third step was to take the square root of this number and add three. The final figure approximates the reading level of the literature.

To insure unfamilarity of the literature, the researcher obtained most of the stories from textbooks not used in the school system. These stories were compiled into a list given to each of the teachers for their final approval of the literature (see Appendix E). This was done to insure the unfamilarity yet suitability of the literature as determined by the teachers.

The SMOG Formula and the survey supplied the necessary information needed to choose the appropriate literature. The story selected for the third grade pretest was "The Town Mouse and The Country Mouse" by Aesop and the selection for the posttest was "The Knee-High Man" by Julius Lester. The story for the fourth grade pretest was "Cap'n Salt Outwits the Wolf" by Carol Carrick and the posttest selection was "How the Camel Got His Hump" by Rudyard Kipling. Finally, the story for the fifth grade pretest was "Basil and the Case of the Counterfiet Cheese" by Eve Titus and the posttest selection was "Jorinda and Joringel" by

The Brothers Grimm.

The classical experimental paradigm was made up of three major components:

1. independent and dependent variables
2. experimental and control groups
3. pretesting and posttesting (Babbie 1983, 188)

Table 1 provides a shorthand explaination of the actual design.

Table 1

Experimental Design

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP A	PRE-TEST	STIMULUS: TEACHING ORAL INTERP. AND STUDENT PERFORMANCE	POST-TEST
EXPERIMENTAL GROUP B	PRE-TEST	STIMULUS: TEACHING ORAL INTERP. AND SEEING A PERFORMANCE	POST-TEST
CONTROL GROUP C	PRE-TEST	STIMULUS: SILENT READING	POST-TEST

By using experimental and control groups and pretesting and posttesting, researchers minimize the possibility for internal invalidity (195). In other words, the possibility that the conclusion drawn from the experimental results may not accurately reflect what went on in the experiment itself was minimized by using the classical paradigm (535).

The only agent manipulated in this study was the modes of introduction to the literature. Experimental Group A

was presented a team-taught[3] unit on the theory of oral interpretation and performed their own oral interpretation production of a given piece of literature (see Appendix A). The unit was presented in five meetings for thirty minutes over a five-day period. On day one, the subjects read the pretest literature and were given both of the testing devices. On day two, they saw a performance of the pretest literature followed by a discussion. The discussion compared oral interpretation to theatre, and distinguished the characters and narrative voices within the literature. On day three, the subjects were given the posttest literature. They then discussed the characters, narrative voice and how the literature could be staged. Day four, the subjects were give assigned parts and rehearsed. On the last day, the subjects performed the work for Group B then completed the posttests.

Experimental Group B was taught the same unit on the theory of oral interpretation. However, day four and five differed from Group A. On day four, they returned to their regular classrooms. On day five they acted as audience members followed by the posttest (see Appendix B).

Control Group C was not taught a unit on oral interpretation nor did they see a performance (see Appendix C). They silently read the literature. Therefore, on day one, they read the pretest literature and took the tests and on day two, they read the posttest literature and took the

tests.

As stated earlier, two dependent variables were measured in this study. They were comprehension and appreciation of literature. With the operational definitions in mind, the testing device (pre and posttest) consisted of questions reporting the subjects' awareness of these two variables.

The testing device for measuring comprehension (see Appendices F-H) was designed with the operational definition as its main building block. The tests consisted of five multiple choice questions for the third grade, six for the fourth, and seven for the fifth. The number of questions was determined by the length of the literature. The questions focused on measuring the subject's ability to understand words in context, to grasp the pattern of thought as a whole, to note detail relationships to the main theme and to draw correct inferences of the main ideas (Peterson 1954, 13). The multiple choice format was chosen because of its familiarity to the subjects. The following is an example of the questions designed for the third grade subjects.

1. The Country Mouse was happy because_____.

   a. Town Mouse was coming to dinner
   b. it was his birthday
   c. he lived in the country
   d. he found some cheese

The testing device used to measure appreciation (see Appendices I-K) involved more development of the detail. In previous studies, appreciation was not measured when considering literary development in any grade level. But, when Bowen, Aggertt and Rickert's definition of oral interpretation was employed, it was impossible to measure comprehension without appreciation. Appreciation was added to this study to create an overall picture of the whole oral interpretation process.

Charles Osgood supplied the basic instrument needed to measure appreciation in his semantic differential scale. Osgood defined his scale as a means to measure "the feelings a person has about a word" (Steinfatt 1977, 81). He continues to suggest that the scale measures the connotative meaning or feeling a person has about a word. It is this connotative meaning or feeling, toward the literature, that the appreciation portion of this study attempts to define and measure. Therefore, the semantic differential scale is supported as a testing device for the appreciation.

Nine bipolar adjectives comprised the semantic differential scales. These nine pairs were selected after conferring with professionals in the fields of communication research, oral interpretation, and communication education.[4] Osgood has shown these bipolar adjectives clustered around the factor labelled evaluation. They were designed to uni dimensionally measure appreciation or the feelings that the

student had towards the literature. The scales were weighted one through seven, with the lower number showing an increase in appreciation. Therefore, a decreased mean score for appreciation would show an increase in the student's appreciation. The following is an example of the bipolar scale used in the appreciation testing device.

Good	____ (1)	____ (2)	____ (3)	____ (4)	____ (5)	____ (6)	____ (7)	Bad
Valuable	____ (1)	____ (2)	____ (3)	____ (4)	____ (5)	____ (6)	____ (7)	Worthless

Because the preliminary research did not uncover an appreciation test that had been proven to measure appreciation, a pilot study was created to provide this information. The pilot study's goals were to ensure the student's familarity with the adjectives in the biploar scale and to test the procedures.

The subjects for the pilot study consisted of six first through fourth grade students grouped as gifted and talented attending a special extended learning program at a school in Vigo County, Terre Haute, Indiana. The second group tested was twenty-six first grade subjects attending regular classes at the same school.

The first group received literary analysis training, performed, and watched oral interpretation productions. At the end of the four, two-hour sessions, they were given the

appreciation testing device. The second group acted only as audience members for a production and then were given the test.

The pilot study uncovered two problems with the testing device. First, the first and second grade subjects could not understand the concept of rating their feelings on a scale between the two bipolar adjectives. After consultation with a professional[5] in the field, it was decided that the final experiment would consist of third through fifth grade subjects. The second problem involved two bipolar adjectives, positive/negative and graceful/awkward. The students were instructed to leave blank the bipolar adjectives that they did not understand or that they felt did not measure their appreciation of the story. Thus, the above mentioned adjectives had to be rejected for the final study because there were a large number of students in the pilot study that did not understand them.

During the pretest, the subjects were given a story to read and then asked to answer questions on the story. The tests were designed to measure the student's comprehension and appreciation of the literature before any stimulus was applied. The comprehension test was made up of multiple choice questions (see Appendices F-H). The appreciation test was made up of nine bipolar adjectives and given first so that the students feelings were not disturbed by the

comprehension test (see Appendices I-K). The scores of these tests was compared with the other groups' pretest scores to insure the representativeness of the groups and were compared with the posttest to help with the comparison.

The posttest was given to the subjects following their introduction to the literature. Experimental Group A was taught the unit, went through the rehearsal process, performed for an audience and then completed the posttest. Experimental Group B was taught the unit, saw the performance and took the posttest. Control Group C read the literature and answered the posttest. All the groups were given the appreciation test (see Appendices L-N) and then the comprehension test (see Appendices O-Q).

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used on the comprehension and the appreciation data to test the hypotheses of this study. The single factor design was used. Each group was introduced to a different mode introduction to the literature. For all measures, the level of significance was set at .05. T-tests were calculated to locate the significant differences within and between the groups and/or grades. The results of the appreciation tests were factor analyzed to check the validity of the instrument.

The comprehension tool was composed of multiple choice questions measuring the subject's understanding of context, patterns of thought, relationships of details, and drawing of correct inferences within the literature (Peterson 1954, 13).

The appreciation tool was composed of nine bipolar adjectives on a semantic differential scale created to measure the subjects overall feelings towards and appeal of, the literature. These bipolar adjectives were factor analyzed for the posttest to ensure unidimensionality or that they clustered around the evaluation factor. The results in Table 2 affirm the unidimensionality of the scale since all items correlate to the factor .50 or higher. The results demonstrate that all the bipolar adjectives are related to each other.

Osgood would define the factor created by these bipolar adjectives as evaluative. This can be explained by listing the bipolars which have high loadings similar to Osgood's evaluative factor: Good/Bad, Beautiful/Ugly, Nice/Awful, Interesting/Boring, Like/Dislike.

Table 2

Unidimensionality of Bipolars

	Bipolar Adjectives	Mean
Item 1	Good/Bad	.73104
Item 2	Valuable/worthless	.68877
Item 3	Pleasant/Unpleasant	.69921
Item 4	Beautiful/Ugly	.72014
Item 5	Nice/Awful	.71633
Item 6	Meaningful/Meaningless	.56147
Item 7	Interesting/Boring	.74278
Item 8	Important/Unimportant	.61011
Item 9	Like/Dislike	.72986

The mean scores of the comprehension and the appreciation were computed. ANOVA and t-tests were calculated to determine the significance of the mean difference. These data were reported within the groups and/or grades. In the first section of this chapter, a report of the results is given. This section is divided into two parts: reporting the results for comprehension and reporting appreciation results. The final section of the chapter will reflect the data in relation to the hypotheses.

The first hypothesis tested the relationship between students participating in an oral interpretation production

(Group A) versus students silently reading (Group C) the same literature. Table 3 consists of the mean scores and t-test[6] for both the pretest and posttest of Group A and Group C.

Table 3

Group A and Group C Comprehension Results

	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	F	t	p
Group A	57.9548	76.9785	2.57	-4.89	.000
Group C	53.6313	60.5611	1.16	-2.03	.044

F = f Value
t = t-test
p = probability

As seen in Table 3, both groups changed in their comprehension of the literature with a significant difference between their pretest and posttest t-test scores. This increase in both makes the evaluation of the cause of the change in A unclear. Thus, it is necessary to evaluate the mean scores of each group. Group A's mean increased 19.0237 points and Group C's mean increased only 6.9298. Though both groups show an increase, Group A demonstrated a 12.0939 point increase over Group C after reporting similar scores in the pretest. Therefore, this increase in

comprehension in Group A is attributed to the performance of the literature.

Table 4 records the mean scores and the t-test for both pretest and posttest when comparing Group A versus Group C by grade. No significant difference was recorded between the Group A pretest and the Group C pretest in grades three through five. These results suggest that Group A and Group C were homogeneous groups on all grade levels.

On the posttest level, the third grade group had a discrepancy between the pooled and separate variance estimates so it was necessary to turn to the F value to determine the significance. The difference was significant and supports the increase in comprehension posited in hypothesis one. The fourth and the fifth grade posttest also reported a significant difference.

Table 5 records the mean scores and the t-test for both Group A and Group C when comparing the pretest and posttest by grade. This information, though not directly correlated with a hypothesis, supports the increase in comprehension posited in hypothesis one for the third and fifth grades. Both the third and fifth grades showed a significant increase from pretest to posttest in Group A. The fourth grade did not show a significant increase from pretest to postest, although the mean scores for the fourth grade reflect an increase, Group A from pretest, 62.1214, to

Table 4

Grades 3 - 5

Group A Versus Group C Comprehension Results

Test	Grade	Group	Mean	F	t	p
Pre	3	A	61.1765	1.02	.77	.443
	3	C	55.3846			
Post	3	A	85.8824	4.38	1.64	.039
	3	C	73.8462			
Pre	4	A	62.1214	1.27	.21	.832
	4	C	60.4167			
Post	4	A	74.9995	1.25	3.36	.002
	4	C	54.1675			
Pre	5	A	51.2986	1.04	.54	.592
	5	C	48.3761			
Post	5	A	72.0773	4.68	4.36	.000
	5	C	52.2732			

posttest, 74.9994. Though not a significant increase, oral interpretation did produce some change in the students. Since Group C demonstrated a significant increase from pretest to posttest in grade three, and grade four did not demonstrate a significant increase in Group A, a comparison was futile. The significant increase in Group A and not in Group C for grade five supported the increase in comprehension posited by hypothesis one.

The second hypothesis tested the relationship between students participating as an audience member (Group B) versus students silently reading (Group C). Table 6 reports the mean scores and t-tests for both the pretest and the posttest of the Group B and the Group C. No significant difference was found between the pretest and posttest mean of Group B. As reported in Table 3, there was a significant difference in the pretest and the posttest of Group C. This creates a problem in interpreting the data because it prevents the conclusion that Group B demonstrated a significant increase and Group C did not from being evident.

Table 5

Grades 3 - 5

Group A and Group C Pretest Versus Posttest

Test	Grade	Group	Mean	F	t	p
Pre	3	A	61.1765	3.58	-3.47	.002
Post	3	A	85.8824			
Pre	3	C	55.3846	1.24	-2.99	.004
Post	3	C	73.8462			
Pre	4	A	62.1214	2.11	-1.73	.091
Post	4	A	74.9995			
Pre	4	C	60.4167	1.32	.91	.369
Post	4	C	54.1675			
Pre	5	A	51.2986	4.84	-4.32	.000
Post	5	A	72.0773			
Pre	5	C	48.3761	1.08	-.89	.377
Post	5	C	52.2732			

Table 6

Group B and Group C Comprehension Results

	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	F	t	p
Group B	61.4687	64.8114	1.07	-.97	.336
Group C	53.6313	60.5611	1.16	-2.03	.044

Table 7 reports mean scores and t-tests for both pretest and posttest of Group B and Group C by grade. No significant difference was reported between Group B pretest and Group C pretest in grades three through five. These results suggest that the Group B and Group C were homogeneous in all grade levels.

When considering the posttest, no significant difference in grade three was reported between Group B and Group C. Therefore, hypothesis two's prediction that Group B would increase in comprehension over Group C was not supported. Grade four reported a significance of .057, just above .05. The mean increase of Group B over Group C in the fourth grade was 11.6849 points. The posttest for grade five displayed a significant difference supporting hypothesis two.

Table 7

Grades 3 - 5

Group B Versus Group C Comprehension Results

Test	Grade	Group	Mean	F	t	p
Pre	3	B	59.4286	1.10	.69	.492
	3	C	55.3846			
Post	3	B	62.8571	1.03	-1.65	.103
	3	C	73.8462			
Pre	4	B	68.6995	1.54	1.44	.156
	4	C	60.4167			
Post	4	B	65.8524	1.19	1.94	.057
	4	C	54.1675			
Pre	5	B	49.6237	1.21	.21	.834
	5	C	48.3761			
Post	5	B	66.1647	1.60	2.66	.010
	5	C	52.2732			

Table 8 records the mean scores and the t-test for both Group B and Group C when comparing the pretest and posttest by grade. This information, though not directly correlated with a hypothesis, supports the increase in comprehension posited in hypothesis two for the fifth grade. The third and fourth grades did not show a significant increase from pretest to postest. As the mean scores for the third and fourth grade reflect, there was some increase from pretest to posttest. Though not a significant increase, oral interpretation did produce some change in the students. Since Group C demonstrated a significant increase from pretest to posttest in grade three and grade four, and grade three and four did not demonstrate a significant increase in Group B, a comparison between groups for the third and fourth grade was futile. The significant increase in Group B and not in Group C for grade five supported the increase in comprehension posited by hypothesis two.

The third hypothesis tested the relationship between students that performed (Group A) and students that participated as audience member (Group B). Table 9 reports the mean scores and t-test for both the pretest and posttest of Group A and Group B. A significant difference was reported in Group A and none was reported in Group B. As the mean scores reflect, Group A increases from pretest, 57.9548, to posttest, 76.9785, and Group B did not.

Table 8

Grades 3 - 5

Group B and Group C Pretest Versus Posttest

Test	Grade	Group	Mean	F	t	p
Pre	3	B	59.4286	1.34	-.54	.590
Post	3	B	62.8571			
Pre	3	C	55.3846	1.24	-2.99	.004
Post	3	C	73.8462			
Pre	4	B	68.6995	1.39	.58	.566
Post	4	B	65.8524			
Pre	4	C	60.4167	1.32	.91	.369
Post	4	C	54.1675			
Pre	5	B	49.6237	2.08	-2.57	.015
Post	5	B	66.1647			
Pre	5	C	48.3761	1.08	-.89	.377
Post	5	C	52.2732			

This increase in Group A supports hypothesis three, that Group A would increase in comprehension over Group B.

Table 9

Group A and Group B Comprehension Results

	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	F	t	p
Group A	57.9548	76.9785	2.57	-4.98	.000
Group B	61.4687	64.8114	1.07	- .97	.336

Table 10 reports the mean scores and the t-test of both the pretest and the posttest of Group A and Group B by grade. Once again, no significant difference was reported on the pretest.

When the posttest results were considered, grade three reflected a significant difference when Group A was compared to Group B. This difference supports the assertion made by hypothesis three that Group A should increase in comprehension over Group B. The rest of the data displayed in Table 10 report that no significant difference was formed in Group A versus Group B during the posttest. The hypothesis was not affirmed for grades four and five, so the mean scores were examined. Grade four increased 9.1471 in mean score for Group A versus Group B. Grade five increased

Table 10

Grades 3 - 5

Group A Versus Group B Comprehension Results

Test	Grade	Group	Mean	F	t	p
Pre	3	A	61.1765	1.12	.24	.814
	3	B	59.4286			
Post	3	A	85.8824	4.27	3.16	.000
	3	B	62.8571			
Pre	4	A	62.1214	1.97	-1.05	.297
	4	B	68.6995			
Post	4	A	74.9995	1.49	1.52	.133
	4	B	65.8524			
Pre	5	A	51.2986	1.26	.25	.807
	5	B	49.6237			
Post	5	A	72.0773	2.92	1.47	.167
	5	B	66.1647			

5.9126 in mean scores for Group A versus Group B. Both grades increased enough to show that there was some effect from performance done by Group A.

Table 11 records the mean scores and the t-test for both Group A and Group B when comparing the pretest and posttest by grade. This information, though not directly correlated with a hypothesis, supports the increase in comprehension posited in hypothesis three for the third, fourth, and fifth grades. Both the third and fifth grades showed a significant increase from pretest to posttest in Group A. The fourth grade did not show a significant increase from pretest to postest. As the mean scores for the fourth grade reflect, Group A increased from pretest, 62.1214, to posttest, 68.6995. Though not a significant increase, oral interpretation did produce some change in the students.

Table 11

Group A and Group C Appreciation Results

	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	F	t	p
Group A	31.0476	25.6032	1.10	2.84	.005
Group C	29.1944	29.0926	1.12	.06	.950

The first hypothesis tested the difference between students that performed (Group A) versus students silently reading the literature (Group C). Table 12 reports of the mean scores and t-test for both the pretest and posttest of the Group A and the Group of C.

Significant difference was reported in Group A and none was reported in aggregate C. As the table reflects, Group A decreases from pretest mean of 31.0476, to posttest, 25.6032, while aggregate C did not. This decrease demonstrates an increase in appreciation according to the testing device, thereby, supporting hypothesis one's prediction that Group A would increase and Group C would not.

Table 13 reports the mean scores and the t-test of the pretest and the posttest of all the grades of Group A and Group C. No significant difference was reported between Group A pretest and Group C pretest in any of the grade levels. This reinforces the assumption that Group A and Group B are homogeneous.

When the posttest results were considered, grade three and four reported no significant difference, with an increase in mean scores between Group A and Group C, consequently, lacking support for hypothesis one. The fifth grade, however, reflected a significant difference, affirming the formation of hypothesis one.

Table 12

Grades 3 - 5

Group A and Group B Pretest Versus Posttest

Test	Grade	Group	Mean	F	t	p
Pre	3	A	61.1765	3.58	-3.47	.002
Post	3	A	85.8824			
Pre	3	B	59.4286	1.34	-.54	.590
Post	3	B	62.8571			
Pre	4	A	62.1214	2.11	-1.73	.091
Post	4	A	74.9995			
Pre	4	B	68.6995	1.39	.58	.566
Post	4	B	65.8524			
Pre	5	A	51.2986	4.84	-4.32	.000
Post	5	A	72.0773			
Pre	5	B	19.6237	2.08	-2.57	.015
Post	5	B	66.1647			

Table 13

Grades 3 - 5

Group A Versus Group C Appreciation Results

Test	Grade	Group	Mean	F	t	p
Pre	3	A	23.7059	1.05	- .29	.775
	3	C	24.6250			
Post	3	A	22.2941	1.41	-1.55	.126
	3	C	27.1250			
Pre	4	A	32.7727	1.70	1.40	.170
	4	C	28.5417			
Post	4	A	28.5000	1.31	1.05	.301
	4	C	25.3750			
Pre	5	A	34.6667	1.11	.36	.720
	5	C	33.7045			
Post	5	A	25.2917	1.63	-2.40	.019
	5	C	32.9091			

Table 14 records the mean scores and the t-test for both Group A and Group C when comparing the pretest and posttest by grade. This information, though not directly correlated with a hypothesis, supports the increase in appreciation posited in hypothesis one for the fifth grade. The fifth grade showed a significant difference from pretest to posttest in Group A. The third and fourth grade did not show a sigificant difference from pretest to postest, although, their mean scores decreased. The third grade, Group A decreased from pretest, 23.7059, to posttest, 22.2941. The fourth grade, Group A decreased from pretest, 62.1214, to posttest, 68.6995. Though not a significant increase, oral interpretation did produce some change in the students. Group C did not demonstrate a significant difference in any of the grades.

The second hypothesis tested the difference between students participating as audience members (Group B) and students silently reading (Group C). Table 15 reports the mean scores and t-test for both the pretest and posttest of the Group B and the Group C. No significant difference was found between the pretest and posttest of Group B or Group C.

Table 14

Grades 3 - 5

Group A and Group C Pretest Versus Posttest

Test	Grade	Group	Mean	F	t	p
Pre	3	A	23.7059	1.32	.40	.689
Post	3	A	22.2941			
Pre	3	C	24.62250	1.02	-1.00	.320
Post	3	C	27.12050			
Pre	4	A	32.7727	1.51	1.44	.157
Post	4	A	31.3953			
Pre	4	C	28.54617	1.47	1.04	.302
Post	4	C	25.37150			
Pre	5	A	34.6667	1.06	3.03	.004
Post	5	A	25.2917			
Pre	5	C	33.7045	1.70	.31	.757
Post	5	C	32.9091			

Table 15

Group B and Group C Appreciation Results

	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	F	t	p
Group B	29.2020	28.1313	1.02	.72	.472
Group C	29.1944	29.0926	1.12	.06	.950

Table 16 reports mean scores and t-tests for both pretest and posttest of each grade of Group B and Group C. No significant difference was reported between Group B pretest and Group C pretest in grades three through five. These results suggest that the Group B and Group C were homogeneous in all grade levels.

When considering the posttest, no significant difference existed between grades three and five. Therefore, hypothesis two's postulation that Group B would increase in appreciation was not supported. The posttest for grade four displayed a positive significant difference to support hypothesis two.

Table 17 records the mean scores and the t-test for both Group B and Group C when comparing the pretest and posttest by grade. This information, though not directly correlated with a hypothesis, supports the increase in appreciation posited in hypothesis two for the fifth grade.

Table 16

Grades 3 - 5

Group B Versus Group C Appreciation Results

Test	Grade	Group	Mean	F	t	p
Pre	3	B	24.6757	1.58	.02	.982
	3	C	24.6250			
Post	3	B	24.7297	1.07	-.95	.345
	3	C	27.1258			
Pre	4	B	30.7442	1.27	.81	.420
	4	C	28.5417			
Post	4	B	31.3958	1.07	2.56	.013
	4	C	25.3750			
Pre	5	B	34.5268	1.18	.28	.778
	5	C	33.7045			
Post	5	B	27.3684	1.71	-1.60	.115
	5	C	32.9091			

Table 17

Grades 3 - 5

Group B and Group C Pretest Versus Posttest

Test	Grade	Group	Mean	F	t	p
Pre	3	B	24.67857	1.51	-.02	.981
Post	3	B	24.72797			
Pre	3	C	24.62250	1.02	-1.00	.320
Post	3	C	27.12050			
Pre	4	B	30.7442	1.24	-.31	.755
Post	4	B	31.3953			
Pre	4	C	28.54617	1.47	1.04	.302
Post	4	C	25.37150			
Pre	5	B	34.5263	1.18	2.05	.048
Post	5	B	27.3684			
Pre	5	C	33.7045	1.70	.31	.757
Post	5	C	32.9091			

The fifth grade showed a significant difference from pretest to posttest in Group B. The third and fourth grade did not show a sigificant difference from pretest to postest, although their mean scores decreased. The third grade, Group B increased from pretest, 24.67857 to posttest, 24.72797. The fourth grade, Group B increased from pretest, 30.7442, to posttest, 31.3953. Group C did not demonstrate a significant difference in any of the grades.

The third hypothesis posited the difference between Group A and Group B. Table 18 reports the mean scores and t-test for both the pretest and posttest of the Group A and the Group B. Positive significant difference was reported for Group A but not for Group B. As the table reflects, Group A decreased from pretest mean to posttest mean but Group B did not. This decrease in Group A supports hypothesis three, prediction that Group A would increase in appreciation over Group B.

Table 18

Group A and Group B Appreciation Results

	Pretest test	Posttest test	F	t	p
Group A	31.0476	25.6032	1.10	2.84	.005
Group B	29.2020	28.1313	1.02	.72	.472

Table 19 examines the mean scores and the t-test of both the pretest and the posttest of all the grades of Group A and Group B. Once again, no significant difference was reported during the pretest in any of the grade levels. This reinforces the suggestion that Group A and Group B are homogeneous.

When the posttest results were considered, all the grades reflected the same results as in the pretest, no significant difference. When the grades were pooled, the difference was significant to support hypothesis three.

Table 20 records the mean scores and the t test for both Group A and Group B when comparing the pretest and posttest by grade. This information, though not directly correlated with a hypothesis, supports the increase in appreciation for Groups A and B in the fifth grade. The fifth grade showed a significant difference from pretest to posttest in both Groups. The third and fourth grade did not show a sigificant difference from pretest to postest, although the mean scores decreased for Group A in both grades.

Table 19

Grades 3 - 5

Group A Versus Group B Appreciation Results

Test	Grade	Group	Mean	F	t	p
Pre	3	A	23.7059			
	3	B	24.6757			
Post	3	A	22.2941	1.32	- .80	.430
	3	B	24.7297			
Pre	4	A	32.7727	1.34	.80	.429
	4	B	30.7442			
Post	4	A	28.5000	1.40	-1.14	.260
	4	B	31.3953			
Pre	5	A	34.6667	1.06	.04	.967
	5	B	34.5263			
Post	5	A	25.2917	1.05	- .65	.521
	5	B	27.3684			

DISCUSSION

The first hypothesis proposed that elementary students taught the techniques of oral interpretation, along with an opportunity to participate in a performance as a reader, would show an increase in comprehension and appreciation of literature. The following discussion will consider this hypothesis in the aggregate and for the individual groups.

The hypothesis was not affirmed with the comprehension tool in the aggregate. This irregularity could have been created by a phenomenon, often called the Hawthorne effect (Babbie 1983, 190). The researcher recorded in a daily journal that many of the subjects in the Group C frequently talked with both of the researchers. This openness was demonstrated in their willingness to help talk about personal artifacts and previously read books on the day the posttest was administered. The presence of this effect may have prevented affirmation of the first hypothesis. But the means and the data by grades affirm the hypothesis, thus supporting oral interpretation as positively affecting the students.

Table 21 reports the findings of the specific cases. When the findings were considered by grades, the hypothesis

Table 20

Grades 3 - 5

Group A and Group B Pretest Versus Posttest

Table 20

Grades 3 - 5

Group A and Group B Pretest Versus Posttest

Test	Grade	Group	Mean	F	t	p
Pre	3	A	23.7059	1.32	.40	.689
Post	3	A	22.2941			
Pre	3	B	24.67857	1.51	-.02	.981
Post	3	B	24.72797			
Pre	4	A	32.7727	1.51	1.44	.158
Post	4	A	28.5000			
Pre	4	B	30.7442	1.24	-.31	.755
Post	4	B	31.3953			
Pre	5	A	34.6667	1.06	3.03	.004
Post	5	A	25.2917			
Pre	5	B	34.5263	1.18	2.05	.048
Post	5	B	27.3684			

Group A and Group C. It is the belief of this researcher that, since the hypothesis was affirmed in all the grade levels, the hypothesis would have been affirmed in the aggregate if the Hawthorne effect had not occurred in Group C. Thus, with the consideration of the Hawthorne effect and the data demonstrating signficance in the specific, hypothesis one was affirmed.

Table 21

Group A Versus Group C Using Comprehension Tool

Test	Grade	Difference
Pretest	3	-
Posttest	3	+
Pretest	4	-
Posttest	4	+
Pretest	5	-
Posttest	5	+

(+) represents a positive significance
(-) represents no significance

When considering the appreciation portion of hypothesis one, the aggregate affirms the hypothesis. Table 22 reports the specific findings.

The results reported previously in Table 13 conveyed postive mean scores for grade three and grade four, but

these increases were not enough to make a significant difference in the specific. When pooled with the fifth

Table 22

Group A Versus Group C Using Appreciation Tool

Test	Grade	Difference
Pretest	3	-
Posttest	3	-
Pretest	4	-
Posttest	4	-
Pretest	5	-
Posttest	5	+

grade, a positive aggregate mean was recorded. Therefore, hypothesis one was affirmed.

The second hypothesis proposed that elementary students taught the techniques of oral interpretation, along with an opportunity to participate as an audience member in the oral interpretation process, would show an increase in comprehension and appreciation when compared to silent reading. The following discussion considered the hypothesis in the aggregate and the individual groups.

This hypothesis was not affirmed for comprehension. As stated with hypothesis one, the Hawthorne Effect in Group C may have prevented affirmation of the hypothesis. Thus, it

is necessary to consider the specific.

Table 23 reports the findings of the specific cases. When the specific cases were considered, the hypothesis was affirmed only in grade four and five. Grade three did show an increase in means, 62.8571 to 73.8462, but it was not enough to be a significant.

Table 23

Group B Versus Group C Using Comprehension Tool

Test	Grade	Difference
Pretest	3	-
Posttest	3	-
Pretest	4	-
Posttest	4	+
Pretest	5	-
Posttest	5	+

When considering the the appreciation portion of hypothesis two, the aggregate B and the aggregate C reported no significant difference. Therefore, the hypothesis was not affirmed. The next step was to consider the specific.

Table 24 reports the findings of the specific cases. The hypothesis was affirmed in grade four. Grade three did not report a significant difference, but did show an

increase in mean scores, 24.7297 to 27.1258. Grade five did not report a significant difference either, but did show an increase in mean scores, 27.3684 to 32.9091. Grade three could have experienced problems with the tool and lack of criteria.

Table 24

Group B Versus Group C Using Appreciation Tool

Test	Grade	Difference
Pretest	3	-
Posttest	3	-
Pretest	4	-
Posttest	4	+
Pretest	5	-
Posttest	5	-

Hypothesis three proposed that elementary students participating in an oral intrepretation production will show an increase when compared to elementary students participating as audience members in the oral interpretation process. The hypothesis was affirmed in the aggregate. Group A reported an increase in comprehension, Group B did not.

In the specific, the hypothesis was affirmed only in

the third grade. This increase in the third grade group could possibly be due to short attention span. In the researcher's daily journal, the researcher recorded that students exhibited restless behavior after fifteen minutes of instruction. Group A did not display this behavior when rehearsing, exhibiting good attentive behavior. Thus, the posttest mean would increase. Table 25 reports these findings. The lack of difference in the four and fifth grade groups could be due to the lack of rehearsal time for Group A.[7]

Originally, Group A was in rehearsal for five days instead of one. This would have allowed the group to develop the technique of dramatic analysis and their characters more, presumably, producing increased comprehension. Since, grade four and five had a long literature selection, time played a more important role in the oral interpretation process.

When considering the appreciation, the third hypothesis was affirmed in the aggregate. Aggregate A had a significant difference and aggregate B did not.

In the specific cases, the hypothesis was not affirmed at any level. Table 26 reports those findings. This occurred because the increase in the mean scores for all the grades were not large enough to make a difference on the specific level. Again, it is the belief of this researcher

Table 25

Group A Versus Group B Using Comprehension Tool

Test	Grade	Difference
Pretest	3	-
Posttest	3	+
Pretest	4	-
Posttest	4	-
Pretest	5	-
Posttest	5	-

that the lack of significant difference between Group A and Group B was due to the shortened rehearsal period for Group A.

Statistical analysis of the data revealed a significant difference in comprehension of the comparisons of Group A versus Group C, Group B versus Group C in the fourth and fifth grades, and Group A versus Group B. In the aggregate, Group A was the only group to show significant difference from pretest to posttest. The appreciation data yielded significant differences among the comparisions of Group A versus Group C and Group A versus Group B. The data affirm hypotheses one and three. While all the findings are not conclusive, they do show that all the groups with oral

Table 26

Group A Versus Group B Using Appreciation Tool

Test	Grade	Difference
Pretest	3	-
Posttest	3	-
Pretest	4	-
Posttest	4	-
Pretest	5	-
Posttest	5	-

interpretation training did show some increase in appreciation of literature. The findings do suggest that the study of oral interpretation is important to the comprehension and appreciation of literature.

When scrutinizing the study, two major errors emerged. The first error created two distinct problems. This error was the lack of time spent in the experimental process.

The original design extended nine days and five. Both groups were designed to meet for thirty minutes on each day. This design was rejected by the school corporation because it consumed too much of the semester for the students. Thus, it was cut to five and four days for thirty minutes respectively. When the times were coordinated with the teachers at the school, additional time was cut. This cut was caused by special courses scattered throughout the week.

The first problem that the lack of time caused was the reduction in rehearsal time for Group A. Group A had only one extra day to develop understanding and appreciation of the literature. One day was hardly enough to assign parts and blocking. If the group had had a longer rehearsal schedule, character development through voice and body would have developed and the understanding of other sources within the literature would have developed. The effects of this problem are reported in the data comparing Group A to Group B. The aggregate affirms hypothesis three, but the specific was only affirmed in grade three.

The second problem created by the lack of time was the lack of criteria to base the subject's feelings on. In the data reported for the appreciation in the specific, grade five was the only grade that displayed an increase. It is the belief of the researcher that this lack of increase was due to the absence of criteria to base the subject's feelings on. To appreciate, certain criteria must be set before an evaluation can be made. Since the groups may not have had time to develop their own criteria for their feelings, the base for the judgements they were making with the bipolar adjectives may not have evolved. This assumption was supported many times by the subjects stating that they did not understand how a particular bipolar adjective pertained to the story.

The second error was the testing tools. It was recorded by a third grade teacher that multiple choice questions were not a familiar type of question to the third graders and that bipolars were definitely not the norm for a measuring tool. This could have been the reason that the results did not always affirm the hypotheses. The fourth and fifth graders had been exposed to this type of tool when they were measured for their basic skills. Thus, for the third graders it would be best to find some other form of measurement or build in a way to expose them to the tool within the teaching unit. This error is only a possible factor in explaining some of the inconsistencies in the study. The study did show that oral interpretation influenced the students. This influence may be stronger with an improved method or another method.

On the basis of the the statistical analysis found in this study, six recommendations are made for continuing research. First, studies should continue to perfect the measuring tools for both comprehension and appreciation. Though both of these tools were considered intensively throughout this study, both could still be improved upon and both must be measured to complete the process.

Second, future research needs to look at the oral interpretation process over a longer period of time. A longer period of time would allow the process to evolve and to create data that can be produced by the stimulus. Plus,

with the longer application of the stimulus, the students could learn to apply the analysis voluntarily. This voluntary application creates the environment for the third recommendation.

Third, future research can measure long term effects on the subjects' comprehension and appreciation. Do the subjects, taught dramatic analysis, continue to employ the techniques? Do their comprehension and appreciation scores continue to show improvement from the subjects ignorant to dramatic analysis and/or the oral interpretation process?

A fourth recommendation is that the actual teachers of the subjects teach the units. This would prevent the possibility that having someone new in the classroom clouds the results.

A fifth recommendation is that this method be used in teaching other subjects bound by literature or dramatic situations. For example, history could be relived in the classroom through oral interpretation, and social awareness could be explained by performing certain situations.

The final recommendation is to try a different genre of literature. This study used prose fiction as the form of literature studied because of the simplicity of understanding prose fiction through dramatic analysis and the students' familiarity with prose fiction. Now that oral

interpretation has been demonstrated with prose, it could be interesting to study the effects oral interpretation has on other genres as a way of introduction for the students. Do students that are introduced to a new genre of literature through oral interpretation have higher comprehension and appreciation levels than students introduced the traditional way? If so, do these same students retain more faster and for longer periods of time?

These recommendations are all avenues that can be explored now that the data in this study have been generated. They will improve our present research and focus in the field of oral interpretation. Just as the intent of this study encourages, future research will accentuate the niche that oral interpretation holds in the field of education.

NOTES

[1] The "cloze method" is a comprehension test. It consist of taking passages from the literature and systematically deleting words and replacing the words with blanks. The student is then asked to fill in the blanks with the appropriate answer. Cloze passages may be used to determine a student's instructional reading level as well as to assess the student's ability to comprehend or understand. This procedure has been used sucessfully with readers, fourth grade through adult (Cunningham, 1981 345).

[2] This subject was discussed with Dr. Sheron Dailey and Dr. Sue Davis, professors of oral interpretation at Indiana State University.

[3] The units were taught by the researcher and Carolyn Heide, a graduate assistant in the same field. Carla Gesell, a graduate assistant in Theatre, assisted in giving the posttest to Group C.

[4] These adjectives were evaluated by the members of the committee advising this research, Dr. Dan P. Millar, Dr. Sue Davis, and Dr. Marjorie Hesler.

[5] Dr. Sheron Dailey was the professional consulted.

[6] The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to compute the mean scores and t-tests, both pooled and separate variance estimates. Whenever there is a discrepancy between pooled and separate variances, the F value is referred to for determining the significance. If the F value was not significant, the pooled variance estimate

was used and if the F value was significant, the separate variance estimate was used.

[7] The cut in rehearsal time for Group A was done at the request of the Vigo County School Corporation. The Corporation felt that the original unit would consume too much class. The original unit included four days for rehearsal.

WORKS CITED

Anderson, Hans Christian. 1945. Anderson's Fairy Tales. Trans. E. V. Lucas and H. B. Paull. New York: Grosset and Dulap.

Babbie, Earl. 1983 The Practice of Social Research. 3rd ed. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Bacon, Wallace A. 1972 The Art of Interpretation. 2nd ed. New York: Holt rhinehart, and Winston.

Bailey, Patrice. 1977. "The Effects of Oral Interpretation and Other Methods of Exposure to a Poem Upon Literary Comprehension and Appreciation." (unpublished M. A. Thesis, Indiana State University.)

Bowen, Elbert R., Otis J. Aggertt and William E. Richert. 1978. Communicative Reading. 4th ed. New York: Macmillan.

Campbell, Paul. 1959. An Experimental Study of the Retention and Comprehension of Poetry Resulting from Silent Reading and from Oral Interpretation. diss. University of Southern California. Ann Arbor: UMI, 1976.

Carus, Marianne, ed. 1985. The Place Called Morning: The Headway Program.Level F. La Salle: Open Court.

Clymer, Theodore and Richard L. Venesky, eds. 1982. Ten Times Round. Lexington: Ginn and Co.

Collins, Raymond E. 1959. An Experimental Investigation of the Comprehension of Prose Material When Read Silently and When Read Aloud. Diss. University of Southern California. Dissertation Abstracts, p. 1059.

Cunningham, James ed. 1981. Middle and Secondary School Reading. New York; Longman.

Gallini, Joan. 1980. "An Investigation of the Relationship Between a Measure of Functional Literacy and Level of Functioning in Society." ERIC, ED 214 997.

Gearheart, Bill R., and Mel W. Weishahn. 1984. The Exceptional Student in the Regular Classroom. 3rd ed. St. Louis; Times Mirror/Moby College Publishings.

Johnson, Edna, Evelyn R. Sickels, Frances Clarke Sayer, and Carolyn Horovitz, eds. 1977. Anthology of Children's

Literature. 5th ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Kleinau, Marion L. and Janet Larson McHughes. 1980. Theatres for Literature: A Practical Aesthetics for Group Interpretation. Sherman Oaks: Alfred Publishing Co.

Maberry, David Ross. 1975. "A Comparison of Three Techniques of Teaching Literature: Silent Reading, Solo Performance, and Readers Theatre." Diss. North Texas State University. Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. 36A, p. 7898.

McLaughlin, Harry G. 1969. "SMOG Grading--A New Readability Formula." Journal of Reading: 639-646.

Mead, Cyrus. 1916. "Silent vs. Oral Reading with One Hundred Sixth Graders." Journal of Educational Psychology 6: 345-348.

Osgood, Charles, George J. Suci, Percy H. Tannenbaum. 1971. The Measurement of Meaning. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Peterson, Eleanor M., Ph.D. 1954. Aspects of Readability in the Social Sciences. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Pintner, Rudolf. 1913. "Oral and Silent Reading of Fourth Grade Pupils." Journal of Educational Psychology 4: 333-337.

Runchey, Geraldine. 1931. "The Oral Approach to the Study of Literature." The Quarterly Journal of Speech 17: 89-95.

Steinfatt, Thomas. 1977. Human Communication: An Interpersonal Introduction. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Educational Publishing.

Stone, Clarence. 1926. Silent and Oral Reading. New York: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Sullivan, Jayne, and Bruce Rogers. 1981. "Listening Retention of Children as a Function of Modes of Presentation." Presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Assoc. (Los Angeles, CA, April 13-17): 1-12.

Sutherland, Zena, ed. 1985a. Burning Bright: The Headway

Program Level H. La Salle: Open Court.

---. 1985b. The Spirit of The Wind: The Headway Program. Level I. La Salle: Open Court.

Swalm, James E. 1971. "Comparison of Oral Reading, Silent Reading and Listening comprehension Assessed by Cloze." Diss. Rutgers University, Dissertation Abstracts, p. 3578.

Taylor, William E. 1980. "Oral Interpretation: An Aid to the Teaching of Ilterature." Journal of Reading 19, 363-366.

Young, William E. 1952. "The Relation of Reading Comprehension And Retention to Hearing Comprehension and Retention.Journal of Communication 2: 58-65.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Oral Interpretation Unit Lesson Plan
Group A

Text: Kleinau, Marion L. and Janet Larson McHughes. Theatres for Literature: A Practical Aesthetics for Group Interpretation. Sherman Oaks: Alfred Publishing Co., Inc., 1980.

Unit Objective: To teach students how to look at literature through dramatic analysis and appreciate through performance.

Procedures:

Day 1

The subjects are given the pretest literature and are told to read it. When the whole class has finished, they are instructed on how to take the appreciation test and it is given. Finally, they are instructed on how to take the comprehension and it is given.

Day 2

A presentation of oral interpretation is given to the students to introduce them to oral interpretation. This is followed by a discussion of 1) what is oral interpretation?, 2) what is the difference between oral interpretation and conventional theatre? and 3) how would you stage this story and what did you see in this one? The students are given a copy of the literature performed by the teachers and the teachers walk through the steps of analysis of the literature.

1) How to select the literature.
2) How to analyze power sources of the literature.
3) Hos to find the production concept.

Day 3

The students are given the literature that they are to perform and discuss using dramatic analysis is evoked.

Day 4

The students spend this time rehearsing.

Day 5

It's Production time!!! This group performs.

Posttest

APPENDIX B

Oral Interpretation Unit Lesson Plan
Group B

Text: Kleinau, Marion L. and Janet Larson McHughes. Theatres for Literature: A Practical Aesthetics for Group Interpretation. Sherman Oaks: Alfred Publishing Co., Inc., 1980.

Unit Objective: To teach students how to look at literature through dramatic analysis and appreciate through performance.

Procedures:

Day 1

The subjects are given the pretest literature and are told to read it. When the whole class has finished, they are instructed on how to take the appreciation test and it is given. Finally, they are instructed on how to take the comprehension and it is given.

Day 2

A presentation of oral interpretation is given to the students to introduce them to oral interpretation. This is followed by a discussion of 1) what is oral interpretation?, 2) what is the difference between oral interpretation and conventional theatre? and 3) how would you stage this story and what did you see in this one? The students are given a copy of the literature performed by the teachers and the teachers walk through the steps of analysis of the literature.

1) How to select the literature.
2) How to analyze power sources of the literature.
3) Hos to find the production concept.

Day 3

The students are given the literature that they are to see and discuss using dramatic analysis is evoked.

Day 4

The students do not meet with the teachers on this day.

Day 5

It's Production time!!! This group acts as the audience.
Posttest

APPENDIX C

Oral Interpretation Unit Lesson Plan
Group C

Day 1

This group will read the literature and take the pretest.

Day 2

Again they will only read the literature and take the posttest.

APPENDIX D

SMOG GRADING

1. Count 10 consecutive sentences near the beginning of the text to be assessed, 10 in the middle and 10 near the end. Count as a sentence any string of words ending with a period, question mark or exclamation point.

2. In the 30 selected sentences count every word of three or more syllables. Any string of letters or numerals beginning and ending with a space or punctuation mark should be counted if you can distinguish at least three syllables when you read it aloud in context. If a polysyllabic word is repeated, count each repetition.

3. Estimate the square root of the number of polysyllabic words counted. This is done by taking the square root of the nearest perfect square. For example, if the count is 95, the nearest perfect square is 100, which yields a square root of 10. If the count lies roughly between two perfect squares, choose the lower number. For instance, if the count is 110, take the square root of 100 rather than that of 121.

4. Add 3 to the approximate square root. This gives the SMOG grade, which is the reading grade that a person must have to understand fully the text assessed.

APPENDIX E

LITERATURE SURVEY

Instructions for teachers:
Please read the following list of possible short stories and mark them as familiar or unfamiliar to your students, and also whether you would approve of them being used in your classroom. You need only complete the section of the grade level which you teach. If you have any additional suggestions of stories for our use please feel free to add them to our list. Thank you.

Grade 3

"The Town Mouse and the Country Mouse" by Aesop	approve____	disapprove____
	familiar____	unfamiliar____
"The Lion in His Den" By Aesop	approve____	disapprove____
	familiar____	unfamiliar____
"The Boy Who Cried Wolf" By Aesop	approve____	disapprove____
	familiar____	unfamiliar____
"The Knee-High Man" By Julius Lester	approve____	disapprove____
	familiar____	unfamiliar____
"Bear Mouse in Winter" By Berniece Freschet	approve____	disapprove____
	familiar____	unfamiliar____

Grade 4

"The Princess and the Pea" By Hans Christian Anderson	approve____	disapprove____
	familiar____	unfamiliar____
"How The Camel Got His Hump" By Rudyard Kipling	approve____	disapprove____
	familiar____	unfamiliar____
"Cap'n Salt Outwits the Wolf" By Carol Carrick	approve____	disapprove____
	familiar____	unfamiliar____
"The Soup Stone" By Maria Leach	approve____	disapprove____
	familiar____	unfamiliar____

Grade 5

"The Queen Who Couldn't bake Gingerbread" By Dorothy Van Woerkom	approve____ familiar____	disapprove____ unfamiliar____
"Basil and the Case of the Counterfiet Cheese" By Eve Titus	approve____ familiar____	disapprove____ unfamiliar____
"Jorinda and Joringel" By The Brothers Grimm	approve____ familiar____	disapprove____ unfamiliar____
"Toads and Diamonds" By Perrault	approve____ familiar____	disapprove____ unfamiliar____

COMMENTS:

APPENDIX F

THIRD GRADE COMPREHENSION TEST

The Town Mouse and the Country Mouse

Read the following questions about "The Town Mouse and the Country Mouse," and answer them on your answer sheet. Darken in the correct circle for each question.

1. The Country Mouse was happy because_____.

   a. Town Mouse was coming to dinner
   b. it was his birthday
   c. he lived in the country
   d. he found some cheese

2. Country Mouse and Town Mouse were _____.

   a. brothers
   b. friends
   c. cousins
   d. sisters

3. The Country Mouse served dried beans, peas and _____.

   a. milk
   b. cake
   c. chicken
   d. crusts of bread

4. The Country Mouse was frightened by _____.

   a. his shadow
   b. the City Mouse
   c. water
   d. terrible roar

5. The City Mouse served dates, cakes and _____.

   a. candy
   b. tea
   c. fruit
   d. pizza

APPENDIX G

FOURTH GRADE COMPREHENSION PRETEST

Cap'n Salt Outwits the Wolf

Read the following questions about "Cap'n Salt Outwits the Wolf," and answer them on your answer sheet. Darken in the correct circle for each question.

1. Cap'n Salt bought an _____.

   a. oar
   b. island
   c. envelop
   d. apple

2. Cap'n Salt kept a goat for _____.

   a. milk
   b. friendship
   c. protection
   d. wool

3. Cap'n Salt had a special weakness for _____.

   a. goats
   b. jam
   c. black jelly beans
   d. cats

4. The first animal Cap'n Salt tried to take to the Lighthouse was the _____.

   a. wolf
   b. goat
   c. sheep
   d. cat

5. Cap'n Salt brought the wolf back from his last trip to _____.

   a. Ireland
   b. India
   c. Mexico
   d. Alaska

6. The wolf ate _____.

   a. the sheep
   b. the goat
   c. fish
   d. jelly beans

APPENDIX H

FIFTH GRADE COMPREHENSION PRETEST

Basil and the Case of the Counterfeit cheese

Read the following questions about "Basil and the Case Of the Conterfeit Cheese," and answer them on your answer sheet. Darken in the correct circle for each question.

1. The Mouse telling the story is _____.

   a. Dr. John H. Watson b. Dr. Don J. Richardson

   c. Dr. David Q. Dawson d. Basil

2. Basil solved the crime in _____.

   a. Jauary, 1894 b. October, 1987

   c. November, 1894 d. October, 1894

3. At Breakfast, Basil had a second helping of _____.

   a. swiss cheese b. eggs

   c. cheese souffle d. cereal

4. The concealed mousetrap was invented by_____.

   a. Dr. Richardson b. Dr. Dawson

   c. Professor Ratigan d. Dr. Tuchman

5. Basil and Dr. Dawson are sailing to _____.

   a. Scotland b. Mexico

   c. Mouseland d. London

6. The number of dentist in London was _____.

   a. twenty-five b. twenty-three

   c. thirty d. thirty-two

7. The head crook of the counterfeit cheese ring was ____.

   a. Bigelow b. Ratigan

   c. Richardson d. Judson

APPENDIX I

THIRD GRADE APPRECIATION PRETEST

Now that you have read "The Town Mouse and the Country Mouse," we would like you to tell us how you feel about this story. Look at the following pairs of words and select the space which best explains your feelings. For example:

GOOD ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) BAD

If you felt good about the story, you would put a check mark in space number one. If you felt bad about the story, then you would put a check mark in space number seven. If you felt somewhat good or bad, then you would put a check mark in the middle of the scale. If one of the pairs of words does not apply to how you felt about the story, then cross them out. Please put a check mark in each of the following scales to explain how you feel about the story.

"I felt _____about "The Town Mouse and the Country Mouse."

1. GOOD ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) BAD

2. VALUABLE ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) WORTHLESS

3. PLEASANT ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) UNPLEASANT

4. BEAUTIFUL ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) UGLY

5. NICE ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) AWFUL

6. MEANINGFUL ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) MEANINGLESS

7. INTERESTING ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) BORING

8. IMPORTANT ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) UNIMPORTANT

9. LIKE ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) DISLIKE

APPENDIX J

FOURTH GRADE APPRECIATION PRETEST

Now that you have read "Cap'n Salt Outwits the Wolf," we would like you to tell us how you feel about this story. Look at the your feelings. For example:

1. GOOD ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) BAD

If you felt good about the story, you would put a check mark in space number one. If you felt bad about the story, then you would put a check mark in space number seven. If you felt somewhat good or bad, then you would put a check mark in the middle of the scale. If one of the pairs of words does not apply to how you felt about the story, then cross them out. Please put a check mark in each of the following scales to explain how you feel about the story.

"I felt _____about "Cap'n Salt Outwits the Wolf."

1. GOOD ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) BAD

2. VALUABLE ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) WORTHLESS

3. PLEASANT ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) UNPLEASANT

4. BEAUTIFUL ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) UGLY

5. NICE ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) AWFUL

6. MEANINGFUL ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) MEANINGLESS

7. INTERESTING ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) BORING

8. IMPORTANT ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) UNIMPORTANT

9. LIKE ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) DISLIKE

APPENDIX K

FIFTH GRADE APPRECIATION PRETEST

Now that you have read "Basil and the Case of the Counterfeit Cheese," we would like you to tell us how you feel about this story. Look at the following pairs of words and select the space which best explains your feelings. For example:

1. GOOD ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) BAD

If you felt good about the story, you would put a check mark in space number one. If you felt bad about the story, then you would put a check mark in space number seven. If you felt somewhat good or bad, then you would put a check mark in the middle of the scale. If one of the pairs of words does not apply to how you felt about the story, then cross them out. Please put a check mark in each of the following scales to explain how you feel about the story.

"I felt _____about "Basil and the Case of the Counterfeit Cheese."

1. GOOD ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) BAD

2. VALUABLE ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) WORTHLESS

3. PLEASANT ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) UNPLEASANT

4. BEAUTIFUL ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) UGLY

5. NICE ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) AWFUL

6. MEANINGFUL ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) MEANINGLESS

7. INTERESTING ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) BORING

8. IMPORTANT ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) UNIMPORTANT

9. LIKE ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) DISLIKE

APPENDIX L

THIRD GRADE APPRECIATION POSTTEST

Now that you have performed "The Knee-High Man," we would like you to tell us how you feel about this story. Look at the following pairs of words and select the space which best explains your feelings. For example:

1. GOOD ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) BAD

If you felt good about the story, you would put a check mark in space number one. If you felt bad about the story, then you would put a check mark in space number seven. If you felt somewhat good or bad, then you would put a check mark in the middle of the scale. If one of the pairs of words does not apply to how you felt about the story, then cross them out. Please put a check mark in each of the following scales to explain how you feel about the story.

"I felt _____about "The Knee-High Man."

1. GOOD ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) BAD

2. VALUABLE ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) WORTHLESS

3. PLEASANT ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) UNPLEASANT

4. BEAUTIFUL ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) UGLY

5. NICE ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) AWFUL

6. MEANINGFUL ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) MEANINGLESS

7. INTERESTING ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) BORING

8. IMPORTANT ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) UNIMPORTANT

9. LIKE ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) DISLIKE

APPENDIX M

FOURTH GRADE APPRECIATION POSTTEST

Now that you have performed "How the Camel Got His Hump," we would like you to tell us how you feel about this story. Look at the following pairs of words and select the space which best explains your feelings. For example:

1. GOOD ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) BAD

If you felt good about the story, you would put a check mark in space number one. If you felt bad about the story, then you would put a check mark in space number seven. If you felt somewhat good or bad, then you would put a check mark in the middle of the scale. If one of the pairs of words does not apply to how you felt about the story, then cross them out. Please put a check mark in each of the following scales to explain how you feel about the story.

"I felt _____about "How the Camel Got His Hump."

1. GOOD ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) BAD

2. VALUABLE ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) WORTHLESS

3. PLEASANT ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) UNPLEASANT

4. BEAUTIFUL ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) UGLY

5. NICE ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) AWFUL

6. MEANINGFUL ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) MEANINGLESS

7. INTERESTING ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) BORING

8. IMPORTANT ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) UNIMPORTANT

9. LIKE ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) DISLIKE

APPENDIX N

FIFTH GRADE APPRECIATION POSTTEST

Now that you have performed "Jorinda and Joringel," we would like you to tell us how you feel about this story. Look at the following pairs of words and select the space which best explains your feelings. For example:

1. GOOD ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) BAD

If you felt good about the story, you would put a check mark in space number one. If you felt bad about the story, then you would put a check mark in space number seven. If you felt somewhat good or bad, then you would put a check mark in the middle of the scale. If one of the pairs of words does not apply to how you felt about the story, then cross them out. Please put a check mark in each of the following scales to explain how you feel about the story.

"I felt _____about "Jorinda and Joringel."

1. GOOD ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) BAD

2. VALUABLE ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) WORTHLESS

3. PLEASANT ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) UNPLEASANT

4. BEAUTIFUL ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) UGLY

5. NICE ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) AWFUL

6. MEANINGFUL ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) MEANINGLESS

7. INTERESTING ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) BORING

8. IMPORTANT ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) UNIMPORTANT

9. LIKE ___(1) : ___(2) : ___(3) : ___(4) : ___(5) : ___(6) : ___(7) DISLIKE

APPENDIX O

THIRD GRADE COMPREHENSION POSTTEST

The Knee-High Man

Read the following questions about "The Knee-High Man" and answer them on your answer sheet. Darken in the correct circle for each question.

1. Mr. Horse told the Knee-high man to eat _____.

   a. grass b. dirt

   c. hay d. corn

2. Mr. Bull told the Knee-high man to eat grass and to_____.

   a. bellow b. swim

   c. run d. sleep

3. The Knee-high man wanted to be tall so he could_____.

   a. play basketball b. ride a bike

   c. fight d. reach a table

4. The Knee-high man was unhappy because_____.

   a. the horse and bull were wrong b. he was sick

   c. he was lost d. he was so short

5. The owl told the Knee-high man to _____.

   a. run b. hoot

   c. climb a tree d. jump up and down

APPENDIX P

FOURTH GRADE COMPREHENSION POSTTEST

How the Camel Got His Hump

Read the following questions about "How the Camel Got His Hump," and answer them on your answer sheet. Darken in the correct circle for each question.

1. The Camel lived in _____.

   a. a box
   b. Howling Desert
   c. Djinn Desert
   d. Arabia

2. The Horse came to see the Camel on _____.

   a. tuesday afternoon
   b. monday evening
   c. monday morning
   d. tuesday morning

3. The Djinn called the Camel _____.

   a. Camel
   b. lazy
   c. Bubbles
   d. Humph

4. The number of days of work the Camel missed were_____.

   a. two
   b. four
   c. five
   d. three

5. The Horse wanted the Camel to _____.

   a. trot
   b. fetch
   c. plow
   d. eat

6. The Horse, the Dog, and the Ox told the story about the Camel first to _____.

   a. Djinn
   b. the Human
   c. each other
   d. the Cat

APPENDIX Q

FIFTH GRADE COMPREHENSION POSTTEST

Jorinda and Joringel

Read the following questions about "Jorinda and Joringel," and answer them on your answer sheet. Darken in the correct circle for each question.

1. The castle stood in the midst of a great,_____.

   a. meadow b. moutain

   c. forest d. town

2. The witch turned men or boys into _____.

   a. trees b. flowers

   c. owls d. cats

3. Jorinda turned into a_____.

   a. nightingale b. turtledove

   c. owl d. finch

4. In the center of the blood-red flower, Joringel found a _____.

   a. bee b. bird

   c. necklace d. pearl

5. Joringel searched for _____.

   a. three days and nights b. six days and nights

   c. four days and nights d. eight days and nights

6. The witch had _____.

   a. seven thousand bird cages b. five hundred bird cages

   c. three thousand bird cages d. six hundred bird cages

7. When Joringel touched the witch with the flower, she _____.

a. melted

b. turned into a maiden

c. lost her powers

d. turned into an owl